UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	Y	DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	: :	DOC #: DATE FILED: 7/25/2025
-against-	:	
ALEXANDER FRANCISCO,	: :	1:22-cr-522-GHW
Defendant.	: : X	<u>ORDER</u>

GREGORY H. WOODS, United States District Judge:

Sentencing for Alexander Francisco is scheduled for July 29, 2025. In its July 22, 2025 sentencing submission, Dkt. No. 804, the Government requests that the Court order that the defendant forfeit \$1,718,968. The Government asserts that amount to be a "reasonable estimate of the defendant's personal profits from drug trafficking." *Id.* at 12.

The Court requests that the parties meet and confer prior to sentencing regarding the Government's request for forfeiture and that the parties submit a joint letter to the Court before 5:00 p.m. on July 28, 2025. The Court requests that the parties indicate in the letter whether the parties agree to a forfeiture award, and, if so, in what amount. To the extent that the "forfeiture is contested," the Court requests that the parties inform the Court of that fact in their joint letter. *See* Fed. R. Crim. P. 32.2(b)(1)(B). In the event that the parties inform the Court that forfeiture is contested, the Court anticipates that it will use the time scheduled for Mr. Francisco's sentencing on July 29, 2025 to instead develop a process to calculate the proper amount of a forfeiture award, including a hearing schedule as necessary.

In its sentencing submission, the Government asks the Court to determine the amount of forfeiture owed by Mr. Francisco in part on the basis of evidence presented in the trial of his codefendant, Alvin Eusebio. Mr. Francisco did not participate in that trial. Therefore, the Court

expects to request supplemental briefing regarding the extent to which evidence adduced in Mr. Eusebio's trial can be relied upon by the Court to calculate a forfeiture award against Mr. Francisco. *Cf. United States v. Roberts*, 660 F.3d 149, 167-68 (2d Cir. 2011) (affirming calculation of forfeiture award against defendant based on evidence presented at that defendant's trial).

To the extent that the parties desire additional time to confer regarding this topic, they may request it. Any extension will require an adjournment of the sentencing hearing.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 25, 2025 New York, New York

> GREGORY H. WOODS United States District Judge